

FY 99 DCMC Performance Plan
(As of June 11, 1999)

Goal 1 - Deliver great customer service.

Objective 1.1 - Provide the right item at the right time for the right price.

PLAS Process Codes - 006, 008, 052, 053, 061, 062, 068, 069, 074, 081G, 083, 083A, 094, 112, 113, 134, 135, and 156

Performance Goal 1.1.1 - Increase the percentage of conforming items (number of lab test successes divided by number of lab test opportunities) compared to the FY 98 result (average for fourth quarter, FY 98). Not measurable at CAO level--database needs to be broadened (currently being tracked at HQ DCMC).

Performance Goal Indicator - Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.7.1.3 – The percent conforming items is calculated by dividing the quantity of source inspected and accepted items which are found usable by the quantity in the population and multiplying the result by 100. Note: A product Quality Deficiency Report (PODR) must be issued before an item is counted as unusable.

Baseline Performance Level – The baseline performance level is percent conforming items for fourth quarter FY 98. This is calculated as a six-month rolling average by dividing the quantity of source inspected and accepted NSNs lab tested/inspected monthly and found usable, by the total number of NSNs lab tested/inspected and multiplying the result by 100. *Note: A Product Quality deficiency Report (PODR) must be issued before an item is counted as unusable.*

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Test results submitted by various service and DLA laboratories.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 066, 081, 081A, 081C,
and 081D

OPR – DCMC-OB (Quality Assurance)

OSR – DCMDs

Target Completion Date – The target is continuous improvement in the percentage of DCMC source inspected and accepted products.

Strategy – We will continually analyze test and inspection data and adjust the Product and Manufacturing Assurance processes to achieve the goal.

Why we are doing this:

Customer Satisfaction

Verification of Product and Manufacturing Assurance Policy

What is the Command strategy:

We will continually analyze test and inspection data and adjust the Product and Manufacturing Assurance processes to achieve the goal

What is expected of the CAOs:
Perform investigation on Deficiency Reports as requested

Performance Goal 1.1.2 – Improve on-time deliveries by five percentage points.
--

Performance Goal Indicator - Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.7.1 –

Divide the quantity of line item schedules due during the reporting period that were delivered during or before the reporting period by the total quantity of line item schedules due during the reporting period. Multiply the result by 100.

Baseline Performance Level – On-time performance during the months of June through August 1998 averaged 58.45% DCMC wide. As a result, target level for FY 99 is 63.45% on-time deliveries DCMC wide.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – For detailed CAO data, use the Impromptu query titled “ON_TIME2.IMR.” To compare performance with other CAOs, use the Impromptu query titled “OT_SUM.IMR.” NOTE: These queries treat (E)stimated schedule dates as actual schedule dates and do not include service line items or variation in quantity stipulations in their calculations.

PLAS Process Code(s) - 081B, 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapters - 4.4

PLAS Program Code – NI031

OPR - DCMC-OB (Manufacturing and Production)

OSR - DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date - September 30, 1999

Strategy -

Why is DCMC doing this: To improve delivery performance on items currently due.

What is the strategy to achieve the desired outcome: A “Delivery Surveillance” PAT consisting of District “Right Time” process owners and field representatives has been formed to identify strategies for reducing delivery delinquencies.

Identified strategies that will be pursued at the HQ level include:

1. Redefine metric computation: design a PowerPlay cube that will provide more precise, accurate, and reliable delivery performance data than that provided by current MOCAS CIDR reports.
2. Refine the One Book and Product and Manufacturing Assurance (P&MA) guidebook delivery surveillance policy and guidance in an effort to focus CAS team activity on reducing delinquencies.
3. Develop policy and strategies for ensuring MOCAS delivery surveillance data is current.

Note that the count for on time is now a “schedule” versus a “contract” or a “line item or CLIN.”

Why we are doing this:

To improve delivery performance on items currently due

What is the Command strategy:

Redefine metric calculation using PowerPlay Cube
Refine One Book and P&MA Guidebook policy & guidance
Develop strategies to ensure MOCAS/SDW data is accurate

What is expected of the CAOs:

Achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and plan, devise and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance
Perform one-time scrub of MOCAS delivery information. Purge all unjustified estimated delivery (E) dates
Ensure office policies and practices are in place to ensure continued accuracy of MOCAS/SDW delivery data.

Performance Goal 1.1.3 – Reduce the number of line item schedules delinquent for one year or less by 10%. Reduce the number of line item schedules delinquent over a year by 75%.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.7.1.5 -
Count the line item schedules in which the scheduled quantity exceeds the shipped quantity, and the delivery schedule date is past.

Baseline Performance Level – 135,167 line items schedules delinquent more than one year. 114,410 line item schedules delinquent less than or equal to one year. FY 99 target is 33,792 line item schedules delinquent more than one year and 102,969 for items delinquent for one year or less.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – For detailed CAO data, use the Impromptu query titled “DEL_CNT.IMR.” To compare performance with other CAOs, use the Impromptu query titled “DEL_SUM.IMR.”

PLAS Process Code(s) - 081B, 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapters – 4.4
PLAS Program Code – NP046

OPR - DCMC-OB (Manufacturing and Production)

OSR - DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy - A “Delivery Surveillance” PAT consisting of Right Time process owners and field representatives has been formed to identify strategies for reducing delivery delinquencies. Strategies that have been identified and will be pursued at the HQ level include:

1. Improving Measurement: Redefining metrics to include a new metric for reducing past due delinquencies.
2. Refine the One Book and Product and Manufacturing Assurance (P&MA) Guidebook delivery surveillance policy and guidance in an effort to focus industrial specialist activity on reducing delinquencies.
3. Develop policy and strategies for ensuring MOCAS delivery surveillance data is current.

CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

To improve delivery performance on items past due.

What is the Command strategy:

Define metric calculation using PowerPlay Cube

Refine One Book and P&MA Guidebook policy & guidance

Develop strategies to ensure MOCAS/SDW data is accurate

What is expected of the CAOs:

Achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and plan, devise and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance

Perform one-time scrub of MOCAS delivery information. Purge all unjustified estimated delivery (E) dates

Ensure office policies and practices are in place to ensure continued accuracy of MOCAS/SDW delivery data

Investment Goal 1.1.4 – Establish a baseline for the ratio of delay notices issued versus the number of schedules being delinquent. The baseline shall be established after Alerts Phase II is fully operational in July 1999.

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: Progress against an established milestone implementation plan.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A. A PowerPlay cube will be designed to extract this data from ALERTS Phase II. Once completed the baseline will be determined by taking the performance during FY 99 after fully operational capable.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – ALERTS Phase II when completed (July 1999)

PLAS Process Code(s) - 081B, 217/A/B/C/D/E

One Book Chapters – 4.4

PLAS Program Code – NP047

OPR - DCMC-OB (Manufacturing and Production)

OSR – N/A

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy - A “Delivery Surveillance” PAT consisting of Right Advice process owners and field representatives has been formed to identify strategies for increasing the number of delay notices generated. Strategies that have been identified and will be pursued at the HQ level include:

1. Measurement: Developing PowerPlay cubes that can extract accurate data.
2. Refine the One Book and Product and Manufacturing Assurance (P&MA) Guidebook delivery surveillance policy and guidance in an effort to focus CAS team activity on forecasting potential delinquencies.
3. Recognize CAOs having exceptional delay notification performance.

Why we are doing this:

To ensure buying offices are notified of potential or actual delays

What is the Command strategy:

Develop PowerPlay Cube for extracting data
Refine One Book and P&MA Guidebook policy & guidance
What is expected of the CAOs:
Nothing at this time

Performance Goal 1.1.5 – Reduce the percentage of contracts that have exceeded their cost or schedule goals by more than 10% over the FY 98 baseline.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.12.1 and 3.12.2 – 3.12.1: The percentage of contracts with projected cost overruns of 10 percent or greater is calculated by dividing the quantity of contracts with projected cost overruns of 10 percent or greater by the quantity of contracts in the population and multiplying the result by 100. 3.12.2: The percentage of contracts with cumulative unfavorable schedule variances of 10 percent or greater is calculated by dividing the quantity of contracts with cumulative unfavorable schedule variances of 10 percent or greater by the quantity of contracts in the population and multiplying the result by 100.

Baseline Performance Level – The percentage of contracts for FY 98, with an CPR or CSSR requirement, that for the year exceeded their cost or schedule goals by more than 10%. (CAOs are required to project the end of FY 98 position in order to determine the baseline against which to measure this goal.)

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – EARNEDVA.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 038, 070, 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapters – 2.2

PLAS Program Code – NP048

OPR – DCMC-OC (Supplier Risk Management)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs (that administer Major Programs or that have EVMS requirements)

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Headquarters, Districts and CAOs will engage in implementing the plan, which is to be developed during FY 98, for addressing the validated process drivers. This plan will include: HQs EVMS Focal Point, Program Integration Focal Point, Product/Manufacturing Assurance Focal Point and Systems Engineering Focal Point working with the District Process Champions. HQs EVMS Focal Point working with the Performance Management Advisory Council to address process drivers that directly relate to service policy and guidance. District EVMS Process Champions for EVMS, Systems Engineering, Program Integration and Product Manufacturing/Assurance working to support CAOs in addressing process drivers within the unique operating environment in which the CAO operates. CAOs will include involvement of Management Councils, EVMS Monitors, Program Integrators and Program Support Team Members. Target is to prototype efforts at 5 CAOs in FY99, CAOs to be determined by Districts. CAO Commanders and EVMS monitors need to plan on evaluating the contractor's EVMS processes for optimization of integrated cost, schedule and technical management while eliminating isolated report generating processes. To facilitate optimization of EVMS, the following training and conferences are

recommended (funding for training and conference need to be fully funded by CAOs). Training: Scheduling and Surveillance Continuing Education; number of people - 2 per District, 2 per CAO; type of people who are to be trained - EVMS specialists and monitors; number of days for training - 5; Tuition costs per person or group - 0; Location(s) - TBD; Conferences/Workshops; National Performance Management Association Conference; Number of people - 2 per District, 2 per CAO; type of people who are to be trained - EVMS specialists, Program Integrators (PIs), Program Support Team (PST) personnel and EVM monitors; Number of days for conference/workshop - 5; Conference fee - \$400 per person; Location(s) (if at HQ, travel requirement would be lessened) - Washington DC. The plan includes DCMC-OF to present at six Project Management or Performance Management conferences. CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance. DCMDI to support the application of EVMS outside the U.S.

Why we are doing this:

To improve management of DoD programs

What is the Command strategy:

By identifying “drivers” that cause programs to exceed cost and schedule goals

What is expected of the CAOs:

Identify drivers in the EVMS Module of AMS

Work with customers and contractors to optimize EVMS implementation at their facilities

Training/Conferences

CAOs will be identified for “piloting” process improvements for management of DoD programs

Performance Goal 1.1.6 – Ensure timeliness of Class I Engineering Change Proposal (ECP) implementation by reducing Class I ECP cycle time by 5% from the FY 98 average.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.10.2.2 -

Class I ECP Cycle Time is measured in days. Cycle Time for an individual ECP is determined by subtracting the date of the contractor’s proposal from the date the program or buying office dispositioned the ECP. The average ECP Cycle Time is calculated by adding the individual cycle times of all Class I ECPs in the population and dividing the sum by the quantity of Class I ECPs in the population.

Baseline Performance Level – The FY 98 Class I ECP cycle time average (sum of cycle times of Class I ECPs dispositioned by PCOs in FY 98 divided by the number of Class I ECPs dispositioned by PCOs in FY 98). (CAOs are required to project the end of FY 98 position in order to determine the baseline against which to measure this goal.)

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – ECPCYCLE.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 062A, 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapters – 4.1

PLAS Program Code – NI032

OPR – DCMC-OB (Engineering)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs.

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Working with the District points of contact will identify the driving CAOs and the drivers that are causing longer cycle times at those CAOs. After identifying the drivers we will develop a strategy to influence these drivers, test the strategy at a few CAOs, and if successful implement DCMC wide. Strategy should include efforts to work with customer liaisons and impacting buying activities. CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

- An acquisition reform goal

- Our customers have indicated this is important

- Timely implementation maximizes the benefit of ECPs

What is the Command strategy:

- Determine which programs are cycle time drivers

- Determine which programs have ECPs open for long periods (>120 days)

- Determine root cause(s) for high cycle time

- DORRA to perform analysis on cost of high cycle time

- Work with buying offices to reduce cycle time

What is expected of the CAOs:

- Track your Class I ECPs in ACTS, key is PCO disposition

- Use your normal contacts to influence the buying activities to improve cycle times

- Manage your part of the process

Performance Goal 1.1.7 – Reserved.

Performance Goal 1.1.8 – Ensure 95% of Alerts Customer Priority Surveillance System (CPSS) Requests are responded to within the timeframe specified by the customer.
--

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.7.2 –

- Divide the number of responses responded to within the timeframe specified by the total number of responses provided and multiply by 100.

Baseline Performance Level – Performance during the 4th quarter FY 98 was 80% of requests responded to on time.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – CPSS.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 081A, 081B

One Book Chapters – 4.4

OPR – DCMC-OB (Manufacturing and Production)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy –

Why are we doing this:

Customer Satisfaction

What is the Command strategy:

Work with District Process Champions to identify process drivers leading to unacceptable response times to customer requests. At the same time identify best practices from CAOs with an excellent response history and incorporate those practices in One Book/Guidebook guidance.

Create Impromptu/PowerPlay queries/cubes that accurately measure progress in meeting targets.

What is expected of the CAOs:

Achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and plan, devise and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Ensure office policies, practices, and resources are in place to ensure optimal performance.

Investment Goal 1.1.99 – Add tasks under this goal to incorporate areas for improvement resulting from the Unit Self-Assessment (USA) that do not relate to any of the goals above but do support Objective 1.1. (Refer to the guidance on supplementing the performance plan on Page C-2.)

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: As applicable

Baseline Performance Level – As applicable

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – As applicable

PLAS Process Code(s) – As applicable

OPR – As applicable

OSR – As applicable

Target Completion Date – As applicable

Strategy – As applicable

Objective 1.2 - Team with our business partners to achieve customer results.

PLAS Process Codes – 071, 093, and 157A

Performance Goal 1.2.1 – Achieve and sustain a customer satisfaction rating of 5 or greater for 90% of the overall customer base.

Measure customer satisfaction by each District conducting a minimum of 25 customer surveys each per month. Results will be entered in the Automated Metrics System (AMS). Surveys will consist of five questions relating to the following DCMC “Rights:” Advice, Time, Price and Item and a question that seeks the customer’s overall satisfaction level with DCMC’s products and services. The survey scale will range from 1 to 6. The meaning of the numbers are as follows: 6 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Satisfied, 4 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Somewhat Dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, and 1 = Very

Dissatisfied. Primary customers to be surveyed are; ACAT I Program Managers, their PCOs, Service Logistics Managers and their associated PCOs. However, Districts have the latitude to survey a broad cross-section of their customer base that are less than ACAT I Program Managers, e.g., ACAT II/III PMs or NASA customers, as the situation warrants.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.11.1.3 -

Total number of overall satisfaction responses rated 5 or 6 divided by the total number of responses equals satisfaction index percentage. In addition to reporting of overall satisfaction results, Districts will also calculate and report monthly the satisfaction index for responses to survey questions for the Right Item, Right Time, Right Price and Right Advice.

Baseline Performance Level – This is a new metric and as such, there is no baseline for comparison.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – DCMC monthly customer satisfaction surveys as reflected in the DCMC Automated Metrics System (AMS). Until AMS is fully implemented, data will be maintained in automated spreadsheets at District and DCMC HQ.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 004

One Book Chapters – 2.4

OPR – DCMC-PA

OSR - DCMDs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Districts will utilize a common series of questions. A process will be developed to ensure Districts do not duplicate calls. This performance goal will be linked to the Customer Support Plan. Data will be rolled up and made available to Customer Liaison Representatives and Districts. CAOs should not budget or plan for this goal. (Note: 25 per month is likely to be excessive for DCMDI.)

Why we are doing this:

Achieve and sustain 90% customer satisfaction level

Identify areas for policy and process improvements

What is the Command strategy for doing it:

Each District will conduct a minimum of 25 customer surveys each month

What is expected of the CAOs:

Nothing

Investment Goal 1.2.2 – Refine the Customer Satisfaction Implementation Plan.

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: N/A - Progress against an established milestone implementation plan.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Customer Satisfaction Implementation Plan

PLAS Process Code(s) – 004

One Book Chapters – 2.4, 2.4.1

OPR – DCMC-PA

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – To establish a detailed customer satisfaction plan to address all customer related issues.

Why we are doing this:

Provide a complementary view of our objective performance measure

What is the Command strategy:

Establish a detailed customer satisfaction plan

Monitor progress against that plan

What is expected of the CAOs:

Follow-up on specific customer input - as required

Performance Goal 1.2.3 – Achieve a satisfaction rating of 5 or better for 90% of all Early CAS customers surveyed.

Early CAS satisfaction will be measured during the monthly customer satisfaction surveys conducted by the Districts pursuant to Performance Goal 1.2.1, Achieve Overall Customer Satisfaction. Four of the 30 customer surveys each District performs monthly under Performance Goal 1.2.3 will include customers who received Early CAS support from that District in the previous two months. (If a District supported fewer than four Early CAS Customers (not previously surveyed) during the preceding two months, it will include those programs it did support in its monthly customer survey). Results will be entered in the Automated Metrics System (AMS). Early CAS questions, like other questions on the survey, will be rated on a scale from 1 to 6. The meaning of the numbers are as follows: 6 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Satisfied, 4 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Somewhat Dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, and 1 = Very Dissatisfied.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.11.1.4 -

Total number of overall satisfaction responses rated 5 or 6 divided by the total number of responses equals the satisfaction index percentage. Districts will calculate and report monthly the Early CAS satisfaction index.

Baseline Performance Level – This is a new metric, and as such, there is no baseline for comparison.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – EARLYCAS.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 012A, 012B, 012C, One Book Chapters – 1.1
and 012E

OPR – DCMC-OC (Preaward Information)

OSR – DCMC-PA, DCMDs, and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – The Districts will use a common set of questions. A process will be developed to ensure Districts do not duplicate calls. DCMC-OD and the District Early CAS Managers monitor the data to identify both isolated instances of customer dissatisfaction as well as systemic trends. The District Early CAS Managers will

address isolated instances of customer dissatisfaction to the appropriate CAOs to effect continuous improvement. DCMC-OD, in coordination with the District Early CAS Managers, will develop improvement plans in response to any systemic problems identified.

Why we are doing this:

To ensure what we are doing is value added, and improve it where we can

What is the Command strategy:

Ask our Early CAS customers how well we are doing, using a standard set of questions

Address customer dissatisfaction, isolated instances, or systemic problems

Develop improvement plans

What is expected of the CAOs:

To provide information needed to support the District's customer interviews and continue to provide quality Early CAS support to our customers

Performance Goal 1.2.4 – Reserved.

Performance Goal 1.2.5 – Ensure 85% of canceling funds do not cancel.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 4.2.2.1 - The unliquidated obligation dollar amount of ACRNs with funds due to cancel is calculated by totaling the positive ULO (material dollars including the Subtransaction Code H Withholds ULO dollars) *plus* the positive ULO Work In Progress (WIP) dollars Subtransaction Code W Progress Payments *plus* the negative ULO WIP Subtransaction Code W Progress Payments dollars.

Baseline Performance Level – As of October 1, 1998, the measurement will be the positive ULO dollars (material ULO including the Subtransaction Code H Withholds ULO dollars) *plus* the positive ULO WIP dollars Subtransaction Code W Progress Payments *plus* the negative ULO WIP subtransaction Code W Progress Payments dollars equals the dollars at risk of requiring replacement funds.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Current canceling funds data is available on the DCMC home page at: www.dcmc.hq.dla.mil/Dcmc_o/cbo/finance/cnclfunds.htm.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 031, 041, 044, 141, 181, 199, and 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapter – N/A

PLAS Program Code – NI410

OPR – DCMC-OA (Contract Financing and Payment)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Continue to provide the field and our customers with data similar to the MOCAS 690 report to identify the ACRN dollars at risk of canceling. Continue teaming with DCAA and DFAS, to facilitate timely completion of audits and reconciliations, which hold up disbursing or dispositioning canceling funds.

Continue to work with our Customer Liaisons to assist the CAOs in expediting any PCO actions required. Increase our efforts to close out all DCMC contract actions as timely as possible to decrease the number of contracts which have ACRNs at risk of canceling. Promote and train ACOs in Quick Closeout methods. Stress the need for ACOs to identify excess funds to the PCO as early as possible in the contract lifecycle. CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

To ensure funds are used within the life of the appropriation

What is the Command strategy:

Keep DCAA involved in process

Provide customers with canceling funds information/status

What is expected of the CAOs:

Perform Initial Contract Funds Status review

Work the burndown plan

Maintain partnership with the PCO, DCAA & DFAS

Performance Goal 1.2.6 – Reserved.

Performance Goal 1.2.7 – Maintain formal Preaward Survey (PAS) Timeliness at 95% on-time rate.
--

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 2.1.2 - The percentage is computed by dividing the quantity of preaward surveys in the population which were completed and mailed on or before the date appearing in Block 10, Date Report Required, of Standard Form 1403, Preaward Survey of Prospective Contractor (General) by the total quantity of preaward surveys in the population and multiplying the result by 100.

Baseline Performance Level –. FY 98 Goal is an 85% PAS Timeliness rate. (CAOs are required to project the end of FY 98 position in order to determine the baseline against which to measure this goal.)

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – PREAWARD.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 021

One Book Chapters – 1.3

OPR – DCMC-OC (Preaward Information)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date –September 30, 1999

Strategy – Visits to selected CAO offices (3) will be made in 2nd & 3rd quarter, FY 99.

The purpose of the visits will be to gather information on PAS process drivers, specifically cycle time. Subsequent visits to "pacing" CAOs (3-5) will be made to identify and implement areas for improvement. Changes to policy and procedures will be made accordingly. CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

NOTE: A related effort, entitled Risk-Based PASs is currently underway. It entails Customer visits/buy-in, a pilot effort consisting initially of 4 CAOs, an evaluation period, and deployment Command-wide with changes to existing policy and procedures and associated tools and training. This effort will take approximately 1 year.

Why we are doing this:

To ensure that we are assisting buying activities with responsible business decisions

What is the Command strategy:

Validate process driver--cycle time

Visit selected "green" and "pacing" CAOs

What is expected of the CAOs:

To provide timely and quality preaward surveys to buying activities

Performance Goal 1.2.8 – Complete 100% of Congressional and OSD suspenses on time.
--

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.1.11 - The quantity of Congressional and OSD suspenses completed by the suspense date imposed divided by the total quantity of Congressional and OSD suspenses received for action.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Internal (DCMC) reporting system.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 194 and 196

One Book Chapters - N/A

OPR – DCMC-BA

OSR – DCMDs

Target Completion Date – Ongoing

Strategy – DLA has identified timely completion of Congressional and OSD suspenses as an area for focus in FY 99. HQ DCMC and Districts will maintain suspense systems to ensure these suspenses are completed on time. Although the HQ and Districts are responsible for ensuring the timely completion of suspenses, CAOs provide input as required to support this performance goal.

Why we are doing this:

DLA has identified timely completion of Congressional and OSD suspenses as an area of focus in FY 99

What is the Command strategy:

DCMC HQ and Districts will maintain suspense systems to ensure suspenses are completed on time

What is expected of the CAOs:

Provide input as required to meet suspense dates

Investment Goal 1.2.99 – Add tasks under this goal to incorporate areas for improvement resulting from the Unit Self-Assessment (USA) that do not relate to any of the goals above but do support Objective 1.2. (Refer to the guidance on supplementing the performance plan on Page C-2.)

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: As applicable

Baseline Performance Level – As applicable

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – As applicable

PLAS Process Code(s) – As applicable

OPR – As applicable

OSR – As applicable

Target Completion Date – As applicable

Strategy – As applicable

Goal 2 - Lead the way to efficient and effective business processes.

Objective 2.1 - Serve as a catalyst for the revolution in business affairs.

PLAS Process Codes - 014, 014A, 047A, 216, 250, and 500

Performance Goal 2.1.1 – Achieve final overhead negotiations within a two or three year cycle for major and non-major contractors respectively. DCAA’s definition of a major contractor (over \$80 million of auditable dollar volume) will be used in determining whether a location is major or non-major.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 4.4.1 - The sum of open overhead years that are subject to negotiated that exist at all contractor segments under the cognizance of the CAO at the end of the period.

Baseline Performance Level – The number of open overhead years that are overage.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – OVERHEAD.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 044, 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapters – 6.7

PLAS Program Code – NI046

OPR - DCMC-OA (Contract Financing and Payment)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Technical assistance visits by the Overhead Center. Site visits to the pacing CAOs. Training Programs will be given on an “as needed basis” by the Overhead Center on various elements of costs (examples: pension, compensation, and restructuring). CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

- DOD CAS Reform PAT recommendation

- Contract closeout

- Canceling funds

What is the Command strategy:

- Provide OHC assistance; site visits to pacing CAOs

What is expected of the CAOs:

- Plan, devise, and budget for their strategy as needed

- Identify major/non-major locations with DCAA

- Reduce cycle time by working with contractor/DCAA

- Seek OHC technical assistance

Performance Goal 2.1.2 – Attain a 96%-100% forward pricing rate coverage at beneficial segments, with a minimum of 68% of beneficial segments covered by Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRAs) and the balance covered by Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations (FPRRs).

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 2.2.1.1 - The percent of contractor segments covered by FPRA/FPRRs is calculated by dividing the quantity of contractor segments that are covered by an FPRA/FPRR by the quantity of identified beneficial contractor segments.

Baseline Performance Level – Average FPRA coverage achieved in the prior fiscal year. For combined FPRA+FPRR coverage, goal is a “stretch” goal over current performance of 93%. (CAOs are required to project the end of FY 98 position in order to determine the baseline against which to measure this goal.)

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – FPRAAMS.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 043, 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapters – 6.2

PLAS Program Code – NI045

OPR - DCMC-OA (Cost and Pricing)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Overhead Center (OHC) outreach programs targeting “pacing” CAOs, including technical assistance visits by the OHC. Telephonic technical assistance by the OHC. OHC Team Page self-help information and guidance. CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

- Support our customers

- Comply with FAR

What is the Command strategy:

- Outreach programs targeting “pacing” CAOs

- Technical assistance visits

- Telephonic “Help Line”

- OHC Team Page self-help information/guidance

What is expected of the CAOs:

- Plan & budget to allow ACOs time to accomplish goals

- Identify training ACOs may be lacking

- Work with ACOs to project possible gaps in coverage

- Get assistance from the OHC BEFORE the gaps occur!

Performance Goal 2.1.3 – Achieve closeout of 75% of other than Firm Fixed Price Contracts, and 90% of Fixed Price Contracts within the FAR mandated timeframes.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 4.2.2.3 –

The percentage of time all contracts close within their FAR mandated timeframes based on type of contract.

Baseline Performance Level – As of September 30, 1998, percentage of closed contracts, which did not exceed:

36 months for Cost (MOCAS Type L, R, S, T, U, V, Y) or

20 months for Other Types (MOCAS Type A, K, Z, 0, or blank) or
 6 months Firm Fixed Price (MOCAS Type J)
 between Final Acceptance Date and Contract Closed Date
 PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – CLOSED8.MDC
 PLAS Process Code(s) – 181, 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapters – 10.2
 PLAS Program Code – NP049
 OPR – DCMC-OA (Contract Financing and Payment)
 OSR – DCMDs and CAOs
 Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999
 Strategy – Develop and field a Cognos PowerPlay cube from an SDW query on contracts
 in MOCAS Part A and B, Section 8, which will take the place of the current
 MOCAS Overage Section 2 report, to allow CAOs to measure their success.
 Continue to monitor CAO performance in moving contracts to MOCAS Section 2
 when they are physically complete and final accepted by the government.
 Monitor the quantity of overages in Part A and B, Section 2, on a quarterly basis,
 by the HQ Process Owner and District Process Champions to verify that the
 quantity of overages does not dramatically increase from a baseline as of
 September 30, 1998, per CAO. Continue to team with DCAA, and the DCMC
 Overhead Center to achieve the “6-12-6” goal of having the contractor submit his
 final indirect cost proposal within 6 months after the end of their fiscal year,
 DCAA to audit within 12 months, and the final rate negotiation/determinations
 are completed within 6 months for major contractors. Follow-up with DFAS to
 assure that all final vouchers/invoices long awaiting replacement funds are being
 included in their funding requests to OSD. Pursue use of Quick Closeout
 methods by ACOs when appropriate. CAOs are expected to achieve their
 negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget
 for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

- Close contracts within FAR guidelines
- Reduce backlog of overage contracts
- Clean up MOCAS database

What is the Command Strategy:

- Teaming with DFAS/DCAA/PCO/Contractor
- Close contract while knowledge is fresh
- Re-engineering closeout process
- Billing Rates vs. Finals

What is expected of the CAOs?

- Institute process improvements
- Utilize quick closeout procedures
- Clean up MOCAS database

Performance Goal 2.1.4 – Ensure that 75% of termination dockets are closed within 450 days from the date of termination.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 4.1.2 - Termination for convenience cycle time is measured in days. The cycle time for an individual termination is calculated by subtracting the date the termination was effective from the date the termination docket was closed. *Note: A docket is closed on the date a settlement is executed or a nonappealable determination is made; all excess funds are released; and the docket is forwarded for incorporation into the official contract file.* The average cycle time is calculated by totaling the individual cycle times for all dockets in the population and dividing the sum by the total quantity of dockets in the population.

Baseline Performance Level – The total number of dockets reported in the Terminations Automated Management System (TAMS) on September 30, 1998. (CAOs are required to project the end of FY 98 position in order to determine the baseline against which to measure this goal.)

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data - TERMINAT.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 172

One Book Chapters – 10.1

OPR – DCMC–OA (Contract Financing and Payment)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – To manage the termination workload to ensure that dockets are closed within 450 days from the date the termination was effective. The Districts are to develop a separate burn-down plan to disposition dockets with an effective termination date on or before October 1, 1996. Management will be able to measure the progress by utilizing the Terminations Automated Management System (TAMS 3.5.5). CAOs should assign workload in a manner that would best accomplish the goal and report the results to the OPR each month via the District. CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

- Continuous improvement of the process

What is the Command Strategy:

- Continuously improve process

- Teaming with customers to reduce T/Cs

- Emphasize early submission of proposal/prioritize DCAA review

What is expected of the Districts/CAOs:

- Level TCOs to workload (36 Dockets per)

- Reduce the overage & work the front end of case backlog

- Ensure TAMS reflects proper reason codes

- Elevate disputes & litigation for HQ legal review

Performance Goal 2.1.5 – Reduce the total number of overaged (over one year from the date of issuance) CAS noncompliance reports by 40%, from the number overaged at the end of FY 98.

Performance Goal Indicator - Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 2.2.2.5 – The reduction in the total overaged CAS noncompliance reports as compared to the end of FY 98. The age of a report is calculated by subtracting the julian date of the report from the julian date of the last day in the period.

Baseline Performance Level – The total number of overaged CAS noncompliance reports reported in the CAFU at September 30, 1998. (CAOs are required to project the end of FY 98 position in order to determine the baseline against which to measure this goal.)

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Contract Audit Follow-up (CAFU) System.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 115

One Book Chapters – 7.6

OPR – DCMC-OA (Overhead Center)

OSR – DCMDI-RO, DCMDs, and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – The Overhead Center (OHC) will perform site visits with District process champions to provide on-site assistance to ACOs relative to technical guidance on CAS issues and recommendations to improve process cycle time. The CAOs should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

Comply with DoDD 7640.2 (Contract Audit Follow-up)

Clear Backlog - Get focus on current issues

What is the Command strategy:

Site visits - pacing CAOs (w/overaged CAS)

Help with understanding of CAS issue

Identify potential resolution alternatives

Develop CAS training guide

What is expected of the CAOs:

Clear backlog - Get focus on current issues

Identify CAS issues and DCAA/contractor positions

Make decision on issue

Improve cycle time for resolving CAS issues

Investment Goal 2.1.6 - Improve the effectiveness of Specialized Safety.
--

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.9.1 – The mishap cost rate is calculated by dividing the costs of mishaps by the total obligated value of contracts with identified safety requirements.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Data currently resides in locally established logs and registers. When the Automated Metrics System is deployed, the data will reside in the DCMC Information Warehouse.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 160

One Book Chapters – 5.3

OPR – DCMC-OB (Manufacturing and Production)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Continue to streamline and update the Specialized Safety process.

Why are we doing this:

- Provide uniform policy and guidance in the area of training

- Maintain a unique workforce of subject matter experts for risk management to ensure effective evaluation and monitoring of contractor risk management programs

What is the Command strategy:

- Redefine metrics and tie to customer goals, like to the “Seven Rights” and drive performance, and recognize Specialized Safety as a CAS process

- Update the specialized Safety process and streamline certification process and training requirements

What is expected of the CAOs:

- Maintain a partnership with DCMC-OI

- Assist DCMC-OI in the improvement of the Specialized Safety Process

- Provide input to DCMC-OI on the improvement process

Performance Goal 2.1.7 – Reduce the year-to-date FY 99 fourth quarter composite unit cost for all basic CAS cost pools by 5% from the fourth quarter FY 98 baseline measured at the District level without increasing the other unit cost pools.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.2.9 -

- Calculate Composite Basic CAS cost per unit by adding all assigned labor and non-labor costs from each Basic CAS cost pool, and divide by total Contracts Managed per Month (CMM) for all contract Kinds. Data for this metric will appear in a separate report, the “Composite Basic CAS Cost per Unit” monthly.

Baseline Performance Level – CAOs are required to project the end of FY 98 position in order to determine the baseline against which to measure this goal.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – FY99PLCB.MDC; DCMC Unit Cost Reports

PLAS Process Code(s) –221

One Book Chapters – N/A

OPR – DDMC-BD

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – The Basic CAS family of cost pools comprise over 55% of DCMC’s annual resource investment and best describes the primary mission of the Command. Reduction in this critical cost area is a stated objective of the DCMC Commander and will describe the effectiveness of the overall Unit Cost Management efforts at all levels of the Command. Measurement of this goal at the District level allows for individual CAOs to exceed the goal, while permitting the total District cost experience to show reductions. All levels of the organization should pursue a variety of actions aimed at reducing the dollar cost per unit this most commonly

provided product/service. Since all elements of cost, e.g., direct labor charges including travel and training, and allocations of non-labor, subcontracts & delegations, and work effort not specific to one kind of contract, are included in each individual contract kind's unit cost, there are many approaches which may be simultaneously deployed to reduce the overall average cost per unit of all Basic CAS kinds of contracts.

Why we are doing this:

- Implement Unit Cost as a Financial Management System
- Move DCMC toward modern business practices
- Manage all costs in terms of the outputs of the business

What is the Command strategy:

- Reduce the dollar cost per unit of DCMC's most commonly provided product/service - Basic CAS by 5% from 4th qtr. FY 98 to 4th qtr. FY 99 at the District level

What is expected of the CAOs:

- Reduce the overall average cost per unit of all Basic CAS kinds of contracts

Investment Goal 2.1.8 – Implement the Unit Cost Implementation Plan.
--

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook Reference: N/A - Progress against an established milestone implementation plan.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Unit Cost Implementation Plan

PLAS Process Code(s) – 191 and 221

One Book Chapters – N/A

OPR – DCMC-BD

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – As the result of PDM II DCMC has been directed to look at alternative financing options (Fee for Service, Working Capital Fund, etc.). All alternative financial approaches require a strong Financial Management System. Unit Cost Management will provide that financial management system. Such a system is being tested in FY 1998 and will be implemented in FY 1999. During this period a system of reports and methods of analyses will be made available to all levels of management. The CAOs will learn to understand the impact of “managing” with Unit Cost.

Why we are doing this:

- Implement the Unit Cost Management Plan

What is the Command strategy:

- Look at alternative financing options
- Alternative financial approaches require a strong Financial Management System, which Unit Cost provides

What is expected of the CAOs:

CAO management learn to manage cost using Unit Cost

Investment Goal 2.1.9 – Implement actions required to institutionalize the Integrated Management System (IMS) at all levels in the Command.

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: N/A - Progress against an established milestone implementation plan.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Milestone Implementation Plan.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 011, 191, 221, One Book Chapters - 0.6, 11.5, 11.6
and 217C 11.7, 12.2.1

OPR – DCMC-BD

OSR – DCMC-BA, DCMDs, and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy –

Why we are doing this:

The purpose of the IMS is to facilitate effective management of DCMC's business processes, which support the mission processes, and to ensure efficient utilization of resources (labor and non-labor) In an effort to institutionalize the IMS Command-wide, DCMC policy mandates that all organizations within the Command will manage their business processes (planning, resourcing, budgeting, and assessment) using the IMS framework. What is the Command strategy:

The Command strategy includes the following actions: publication/update of the IMS One Book chapter, update of the Business Processes Guidebook, to include improved documentation of the District and CAO processes, update of the integrated IMS schedule, and development of web-based training on the IMS.

What is expected of the CAOs:

The CAOs are expected to manage their business processes in accordance with the policy contained in the applicable One Book chapters and the procedures outlined in the Business Processes Guidebook. The Districts and select CAOs will also be called upon periodically to provide representatives for DCMC teams that are executing the Command strategy, such as the Business Process Team, the Planning Team, and the IMS Training Team.

Performance Goal 2.1.10 – Implement Electronic Document Workflow (EDW) at 80 percent of designated DCMC sites. (Designated sites are: Boston, Clearwater, Phoenix, Sikorsky, and Textron.)

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.2.6 - Count of sites where EDW is fully deployed divided by the count of sites scheduled to have completed EDW deployment and multiplying the result by 100.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Manual input from designated sites.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 212, 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapters – N/A

PLAS Program Code – NV528

OPR – DCMC-O (Paperless)

OSR – DCMDs and designated CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Incorporate lessons learned and experiences from five CAO test sites where EDW is currently deployed (Boston, Clearwater, Phoenix, Sikorsky and Textron) into future deployment efforts.

Why we are doing this:

Management Reform Memorandum #2 - Transition to a paperless contracting process by January 1, 2000

What is the Command strategy:

Incorporate lessons/experiences from CAO test sites

Identify DCMC sites for EDW deployment

Provide training/assistance during deployment

Deploy at 80% of designated DCMC sites

What is expected of the CAOs:

Have a plan for transitioning to EDW

Assure workforce develops skills in using EDW

Report implementation progress/problems

Performance Goal 2.1.11 – Ensure that 90% of all GSA leased vehicles in the DCMC fleet meet a minimum utilization rate of 98% (CONUS).

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.1.12 -

Number of leased vehicles with a utilization rate of 98% (the number of miles traveled during the reporting period divided by the number of miles targeted during the reporting period), divided by the number of vehicles assigned.

Baseline Performance Level – Number of vehicles with a utilization rate of 98% as of September 30, 1998. PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – EMACS

PLAS Process Code(s) – 211

One Book Chapters– Under development

OPR – DCMC-BA

OSR –DCMDs and CAOs Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Mandated by DoD 4500.36R, Management Acquisition, and Use of Motor Vehicles. Additionally, we are mandated to replace 75% of our vehicles with Alternative Fuel Vehicles (AFVs) at the estimated additional cost of \$2,089 per vehicle. Utilization goals are established as management indicators to measure the average annual use of a particular type of motor vehicle on an installation. As a result of limited non-labor funding and the AFV mandate, it is extremely costly for managers to maintain vehicles with less than 98% utilization, especially higher cost vehicles, e.g., vans. Motor vehicle utilization goals shall be reviewed quarterly to ensure that effective asset management is being achieved.

Vehicle Classification	Type	Estimated Annual Cost*	Annual Mileage Standards
-----------------------------------	-------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Sedan	All	\$3,000	10,000
Van	All	\$3,500	10,000

*Includes \$.10 per mile for annual mileage standard.

Utilization rate is measured annually against mileage standards (e.g., 98% of 10,000 miles = 9,800 miles).

Each District and CAO should monitor their fleet in order to identify and report on underutilized vehicles (those vehicles which have under a 98% utilization rate). Vehicles which are determined to be underutilized will be returned to GSA and will not be replaced.

Why we are doing this:

Mandated by DoD 4500.36R, Management Acquisition, and Use of Motor Vehicles; and to reduce our infrastructure costs. Additionally, we are mandated to replace 75% of our vehicles with Alternative Fuel Vehicles (AFVs) at the estimated additional cost of \$2,089 per vehicle.

What is the Command strategy:

Utilization goals are established as management indicators to measure the average annual use of a particular type of motor vehicle on an installation. As a result of limited non-labor funding and the AFV mandate, it is extremely costly for managers to maintain vehicles with less than 98% utilization, especially higher cost vehicles, e.g., vans. Motor vehicle utilization goals shall be reviewed quarterly to ensure that effective asset management is being achieved.

What is expected of the CAOs:

CAO managers should monitor their fleet in order to identify and report on underutilized vehicles (those vehicles which have under a 98% utilization rate). Vehicles which are determined to be underutilized will be returned to GSA and will not be replaced.

Performance Goal 2.1.12 – Reduce net usable space at non-contractor locations (to include GSA leased space and space acquired by an Interservice Support Agreement (ISA)) in accordance with DLAR 5305.2 (each operating location is authorized 130 net square feet per person after consideration for special use space).

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.1.9 –

Divide the quantity of square feet of useable office space at the operating location at the end of the calendar year by the quantity of employees assigned to the operating location at the end of the calendar year. If the result is greater than 130, the operating location exceeds authorization. (Note: Useable square feet is determined by subtracting the quantity of square feet of office space for special use from the total quantity of square feet of office space.)

Baseline Performance Level – 46 DCMC locations exceed the authorization.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – DLA Form 662, Administrative Space Assignment and Use Summary developed annually in December

PLAS Process Code(s) – 211

One Book Chapters – N/A

OPR – DCMC-BA

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – DCMC HQ is tracking this data to reduce infrastructure costs. DCMC HQ reviews DLA Form 662 to determine where excess space exists. DCMC HQ tasks the Districts to explore Business Case options for relocating, facility downsizing/ realignment. This is done on a case-by-case basis. DCMC HQ will continue to assign rating criteria (green/yellow/red) for MMR reporting. Budget should be submitted by each CAO operating location where office facility downsizing/realignment is approved.

Why we are doing this:

DCMC HQ is tracking this data to reduce infrastructure costs

What is the Command strategy:

DCMC HQ reviews DLA Form 662 to determine where excess space exists and tasks the Districts to explore Business Case options for relocating, facility downsizing/realignment

What is expected of the CAOs:

DCMC HQ will continue to assign rating criteria (green/yellow/red) for MMR reporting. Budget should be submitted by each CAO operating location where office facility downsizing/realignment is approved.

Performance Goal 2.1.13 – Reduce the quantity of high grade positions (GS 14, 15, and SES) throughout DCMC to 499.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.1.5 - The quantity of high grade civilian employees is calculated by totaling the quantity of civilian employees in grades 14, 15, and SES.

Baseline Performance Level – The quantity of high grade civilian employees in grades 14, 15, and SES as of September 30, 1998. (CAOs are required to project the end of FY 99 position in order to determine the baseline against which to measure this goal.)

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – DCMCPEOP.MDC/Defense Civilian Personnel Data System (DCPDS) and is provided to DCMC-BA on a quarterly basis by CAHI.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 223

One Book Chapters – N/A

OPR – DCMC-BA

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – This effort is mandated by DoD. The desired outcome is continuous improvement of the process so that the quantity of high grade civilian employees is reduced below the Agency goal. DCMC HQ, Districts, and CAOs will

continue to review position descriptions and review the structure of their organizations. A GS-14 review is in process Command-wide. All high grade positions require approval of the RUC and the DCMC Executive Planning Board.

Why we are doing this:

To meet the DoD goal

What is the Command strategy:

Reduce high grades in proportion with downsizing initiative

What is expected of the CAOs:

To review organization structure and position descriptions

Performance Goal 2.1.14 – Increase the ratio of civilian employees to civilian supervisors to 14:1.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.1.4 - The supervisory ratio is calculated by dividing the quantity of non-supervisory employees in the population by the quantity of supervisory employees in the population.

Baseline Performance Level – 14:1 (FY 99 target)

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – DCMCPEOP.MDC/Defense Civilian Personnel Data System (DCPDS) and is provided to DCMC-BA on a quarterly basis by CAHI. Supervisory employees are identified in DCPDS by codes 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 in the supervisory code field. Non-supervisory employees are identified by code 8.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 223

One Book Chapters – N/A

OPR – DCMC-BA

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Mandated by NPR and DoD. The overall goal for supervisory ratio is 16 to 1, however at this time, it is a stretch goal for DCMC. DCMC will be rated at 14 to 1 during FY 99. The DCMC HQ, Districts, CAOs will review position descriptions and organization structure to continuously improve the process so the ratio of civilian employees to supervisors is increased to 14:1.

Why we are doing this:

To meet the NPR goal

What is the Command strategy:

To review position descriptions and implement work leader guidelines as appropriate

What is expected of the CAOs:

To reduce intermediate level of management and meet 14:1 ratio

Performance Goal 2.1.15 – Achieve and maintain the percentage of overage undefinitized contract actions at 10% or less.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 2.2.2.1 - The percent of UCAs on hand that are overage is calculated by dividing the quantity of UCAs on hand that are overage by the quantity of UCAs in the population and multiplying the result by 100. (Note: To determine if a UCA is overage, subtract the date the UCA was issued from the date of the last day of the period. If the result is more than 180, the UCA is overage.)

Baseline Performance Level – To determine if a UCA is overage, subtract the date the UCA was issued from the date of the last day of the period. If the result is more than 180, the UCA is overage.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – UCAS.MDC/AMS Pricing and Negotiation Module.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 041, 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapters – 6.6

PLAS Program Code – NI044

OPR – DCMC-OA (Cost and Pricing)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Institute policy changes and process improvements both within DCMC and customer buying offices as necessary. Deploy Computer Aided Parametric Estimating (CAPE) software at five offices where non-receipt of a contractor proposal is the main driver (\$25,000). Evaluate C&T bulk funding concept for possible expansion. Accomplish a new pareto analysis to determine if the main process drivers for overage UCAs continue to be late proposals, insufficient funds, awaiting GFP/Repairables. The cost to accomplish the pareto analysis is estimated at 1 person, visiting 6 sites, for two days each site, equals \$ 2,880 labor and \$4,200 non-labor costs per district. (West & East), or a grand total of \$14,160 (\$5,760 labor and \$8,400 non-labor. Where awaiting GFP/Repairables continue to be a problem, continue to work with the buying offices to look for alternatives to UCAs (\$5,000). Continue to use IOAs to look at CAOs primarily in the area where there are problems in interpreting pricing negotiation techniques - SFAs can address these deficiencies. CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

Sooner we definitize, we shift the risk from Gov't to Ktr. Proposals definitized at price lower than the total funds obligated/committed, frees funds for use elsewhere

What is the Command strategy:

Deploy Computer Aided Parametric Estimating software where it makes sense (i.e., lots of spares, commercial parts)

Do follow-on pareto analysis at 6 CAOs per District to revalidate process drivers, and dig deeper

What is expected of the CAOs:

Use AMS to manage UCA workload.

Identify root causes of overage UCAs.

Develop corrective action/process improvement plan when their goal is not reached.

When negotiation cycle time is a process driver, identify and implement initiatives to shorten negotiation cycle time.

Support HQ in working issues with the Buying Activities.

CAOs are expected to achieve their performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance

Performance Goal 2.1.16 – Improve Negotiation Cycle Time.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 2.2.2 – Cycle time to complete an individual price negotiation is calculated by subtracting the date the delivery order or modification was issued from the date the contractor's proposal was received. The average cycle time is calculated by adding the individual cycle times for all actions completed during the period and dividing the sum by the quantity of actions in the population.

Baseline Performance Level – data not available

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – ACONEGOT.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 041, 041A, 217/A/B/C/D/E One Book Chapters – 6.6

PLAS Program Code – NI043

OPR – DCMC-OA (Cost and Pricing)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Fully implement those initiatives already started (e.g. IPT Pricing, eliminating unnecessary documentation, and unnecessary audits and technical reviews, educating the workforce on new pricing regulations and policies and methods to implement those, and introducing more bulk funding for mods and change orders). Much of the success is dependent on our functional SFAs making sure our CAO workforce knows what these new regulations and procedures are and making sure they have the knowledge base and tools needed to implement the new regulations and procedures. In addition to utilizing the SFAs, we plan to provide our workforce with negotiations and TSN training (including training related to the specific item or commodity for which the TSNs are being done), and to conduct a Pricing Conference. CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why are we doing this:

To provide better support to our customers

What's the Command strategy:

Fully implement new methods (e.g. educate workforce on new pricing regulations and methods to implement)

Conduct a root-cause analysis to target cycle time drivers

What is expected of the CAOs:

Break down the negotiation process to its elements and determine the process drivers. Then, for those drivers that we have control over, develop a method to reduce the processing time associated with these drivers. Implement a revised process that eliminates non-value added effort associated with the process for efficiency. Goal to be determined and incorporated into the plan prior to June 1, 1999. CAOs should be aware that there will be some resource requirement.

Performance Goal 2.1.17 – Maintain the percentage of on-time contractual aircraft deliveries for all new manufactured, overhauled, modified, and contractually maintained aircraft under the cognizance of DCMC Flight Operations at 90% or greater.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.8.1.2 -
 Scheduled deliveries are defined as the number of aircraft deliveries scheduled by the contract to be integrated or repatriated to a buying activity. Actual Deliveries (AD) are defined as the number of actual accepted aircraft from the contractor as a result of DCMC Flight Operations favorable flight test and acceptance and subsequent DD 250 to the customer by the DCMC QAR. The Aircraft Delivery Rate (ADR) equals the number of actual deliveries divided by the number of Contractual Scheduled Deliveries (CSD): $ADR = AD/CSD$. Tracking the ADR will help identify strengths and weaknesses in the aircraft delivery process which will be reported to the DCMC Commander to facilitate the exploitation of efficiencies and the reduction or elimination of inefficiencies.

Baseline Performance Level – Start FY 99

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – DCMC Information Repository
 Automated Metrics System (DIRAMS)

PLAS Process Code(s)- 064

One Book Chapters – 8.1

OPR - DCMC-AF

OSR - DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date - September 30, 1999

Strategy – Determine the overall DCMC ADR which will help identify efficiencies and inefficiencies in our flight operations processes. Target those deficient areas and dedicate necessary resources to improve operations. Other related aircraft delivery areas of operation (contractor performance, QAR functions, and program management), but not directly influenced by DCMC Flight Operations will be reported to the DCMC Commander.

Why we are doing this:

ADR tracking is a meaningful and practical process for DCMC Flight Operations to determine effectiveness in our flight test and acceptance mission. It is meaningful to our customer, the buying activity, and the data can be extrapolated to help improve aircraft manufacturing and overhaul process design, aircraft quality assurance procedures/criteria, and can help identify process factors most likely to impact quality of the end item.

What is the Command strategy:

Make the data collection process economical by using related and reasonable to obtain data from the aircraft contract (scheduled deliveries) and from DCMC Flight Operations (actual deliveries) where aircraft are accepted by flight facilities under the cognizance of the contract administration office for a given period. Use the data to identify trends and factors that most likely impact quality and acceptance of the aircraft. Dedicate resources towards those trends and factors causing deficiencies in flight operations processes upon which Flight Operations has influence (aircrew availability, qualification, proficiency, currency, training, equipment, mishap prevention, flight operations safety).

What is expected of the CAOs:

Facilitate implementation of ADR tracking. Provide support to Chiefs of Flight Operations, Government Flight Representatives and Aviation Program Teams

Investment Goal 2.1.18 – Engage in activities to ensure complete and accurate reporting of Cost Savings and Cost Avoidances – Return on Investment (ROI).

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: N/A – Progress against an established milestone implementation plan.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – ROI.MDC (The source of data for termination cost savings is TAMS. The source of data for government property reutilization and proceeds from sales is DADS. The source of data for SPI is the SPIS database. The source of data for Cost Accounting Standards is CAFU. The source of data for all other elements is AMS/DIRAMS.)

PLAS Process Code(s) – 031, 041, 044, 082, 102, One Book Chapters – Various 105, 115, 116, 145, 196, and 199

OPR – DCMC-OC (Supplier Risk Management)

OSR – DCMCC-F, DCMDs, and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – No target performance. DCMC-OC and DCMCC-FB will monitor the cost savings and cost avoidance reporting to determine if there are problems with the ROI cube programming and how it pulls its data from other systems. Districts will assign an individual as the District ROI process champion. On at least a quarterly basis the District ROI process champion shall review ROI cube, Impromptu, other electronic data for all of its CAOs to determine if it appears that each CAO is inputting accurate and complete data. These reviews will be done in the District office. Examples of what might be found during these reviews are: (1) a CAO enters \$45,000,000,000 for July for the Negotiation Savings category when the normal figure is more like \$20,000,000 or less per month for the CAO and (2) a CAO has no data entered for any of the months for the Negotiation Savings category and it is known that they do a lot of negotiations. The District ROI process champion will work with CAOs on apparent inaccurate and incomplete data. This will be done by e-mail or telephone. Quarterly reports of these District ROI process champion efforts shall be provided to DCMC-OC within 25 calendar days after completion of each fiscal quarter. The report shall

be three pages or less and shall have the following three column headings across the top of each page:

<u>CAO</u>	<u>Data Status Per District Review</u>	<u>District Corrective Action Taken and the Results of that Action</u>
------------	--	--

The entry below the column heading “Data Status Per District Review” shall be one or more of the following for each CAO:

CAO’s data appears to be accurate and complete,

CAO’s data appears to be inaccurate in the following category(ies)...., and/or

CAO’s data appears to be incomplete in the following category(ies)....

Why we are doing this:

To prevent the unnecessary expenditure of funds by our customers and save taxpayer dollars.

What is the Command strategy:

DCMC-OC and DCMCC-FB will monitor the cost savings and cost avoidance reporting to determine if there are problems with the ROI cube programming and how it pulls its data from other systems. Districts will assign an individual as the District ROI process champion. On at least a quarterly basis the District ROI process champion shall review ROI cube, Impromptu, other electronic data for all of its CAOs to determine if it appears that each CAO is inputting accurate and complete data.

What is expected of the CAOs:

CAO strategies need to focus on data integrity and ensure employees are aware of all ROI opportunities. Ensure accurate and complete reporting of applicable cost savings and avoidances.

Performance Goal 2.1.19 –Achieve and maintain PLAS reporting rate of at least 98% of the paid hours for DCMC HQ, each District staff, and all CAOs. Complete, accurate PLAS reporting is requisite to supply labor costs for the development of Unit Cost Management.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.1.14 -
 PLAS adjusted hours divided by paid hours from DBMS for each activity.

Paid Hours from DBMS = current month Total Paid Hours on the UPCC760A report.

PLAS Adjusted Hours = Work Hours + Leave Hours less the following unpaid hours:

Military Hours

CR – Religious compensatory time earned

CD – Credit hours earned

CE – Compensatory time earned

CC – Compensatory time callback

KE – Furlough

KA – Leave without pay

KB – Suspension – Unpaid

KC – Absent without official leave

KD – Worker Comp - Unpaid

Baseline Performance Level – Number of organizations with reporting rate less than 98% as of September 30, 1998

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – PLAS.MDC. PLAS Program Management Center publishes a spreadsheet monthly showing the PLAS reporting rate for each DCMC organization. This report is sent to the DCMC HQ and District PLAS Administrators for further distribution.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 212 One Book Chapters – N/A

OPR – DCMC-BD/PLAS Program Management Center

OSR – DCMC HQ, DCMDs, and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – In Program Decision Memorandum II, dated October 15, 1998, OSD charged DCMC with evaluating alternate funding strategies to ensure that all missions are financed in the most effective manner. DCMC is developing and testing a management strategy based on Unit Cost. In order to derive costs from PLAS hours, those hours must be reported completely and accurately. This performance goal is designed to define and set a target for ‘complete reporting’.

Why we are doing this:

PLAS data is put to many uses, not the least of which is developing Unit Cost. Complete reporting is an important facet of data integrity. Are all the hours that are supposed to be reported actually being reported? This goal sets a measurable target for ‘complete reporting’.

What is the Command strategy:

Reporting goals are established as management indicators to measure the completeness of the data reported into PLAS.

What is expected of the CAO:

DCMC HQ, each District staff, and each CAO should monitor their percentage of PLAS reporting monthly. When reporting falls below 98% target, aggressive actions should be taken to identify causes and institute corrective actions.

Constant vigilance is the price of a strong defense.

Investment Goal 2.1.99 – Add tasks under this goal to incorporate areas for improvement resulting from the Unit Self-Assessment (USA) that do not relate to any of the goals above but do support Objective 2.1. (Refer to the guidance on supplementing the performance plan on Page C-2.)

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: As applicable

Baseline Performance Level – As applicable

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – As applicable

PLAS Process Code(s) – As applicable

OPR – As applicable

OSR – As applicable

Target Completion Date – As applicable

Strategy – As applicable

Objective 2.2 - Accelerate acquisition reform by applying commercial processes and practices.

PLAS Process Codes – 005 and 132

Performance Goal 2.2.1 – Increase the number of paperless transactions to 90% of all transactions occurring in the Progress Payment, Material Inspection, and Receiving Report (DD 250), and contract closeout processes assigned to DCMC during FY 99. (Supports MRM #2)

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.2.7 –

Determine the percentage of paperless transactions for each MRM #2 project by dividing the estimate/count of paperless transactions processed during the reporting period by all transactions processed during the reporting period and multiplying the result by 100.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Manual input from CAOs, DFAS, SDW/MOCAS.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 081F, 141, 145, 181, 199, One Book Chapters - N/A
and 217/A/B/C/D/E

PLAS Program Code – NV053

OPR – DCMC-O (Paperless)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy - DD 250 and contract closeout: two Joint Service/Agency Working Integrated

Product Teams (WIPTs) are being formed to conduct a comprehensive reengineering of these processes with the view of streamlining and making them paperless. Specific measures of success will be addressed in the WIPT recommendations. The WIPTs are expected to complete their efforts within 60 days. Progress payments: Increase contractor participation in electronic Data Interchange (EDI) for progress payments. EDI progress payments are defined as progress payment requests processed into MOCAS using the Standard Electronic Processing System (SEPS) program.

Why we are doing this:

Management Reform Memorandum #2--Transition to a paperless contracting process by January 1, 2000

What is the Command strategy:

Increase contractor use of EDI Progress Payments

Deploy new systems for DD 250 and Contract Closeout

Increase paperless transactions to 90% of total

What is expected of the CAOs:

Encourage greater contractor participation

Have a plan for transitioning to new systems

Assure workforce develops needed skills

Report implementation progress/problems

Performance Goal 2.2.2 – Increase the amount of excess property disposed of by 20% over FY 98. (Supports MRM #5).

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.2.1.2 - The dollar amount of property reported excess is calculated by determining the acquisition cost of all property disposed of in FY 98.

Baseline Performance Level – \$2.1 Billion x 1.2 (20% increase) = \$2.5 Billion

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – DADS

PLAS Process Code(s) – 105, 102, 217/A/B/C/D/E

One Book Chapters – 10.2.1

PLAS Program Code – NI017

OPR – DCMC-OA (Government Property)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – The synopsis of the discrete activities that will be accomplished at the HQ level to facilitate performance goal achievement and any assumptions or direction to lower level implementing organizations for them to accurately describe their own implementation activities and budget requirements. MRM #5 Implementation Plan. CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated

performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

- Supports MRM #5 goal (20% reduction)
- \$43 Bil in Government property universe

What is the Command Strategy:

- Guidance to Districts
- PCARSS fielding by end of FY

What is expected of the CAOs:

- Increased focus on reviews and reporting
- Ensure schedules are complete
- Prioritize plant clearance
- Make sure services respond before disposal
- Elevate non-responses

Performance Goal 2.2.3 – Reduce the amount of Lost, Damaged and Destroyed (LDD) Government property.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 3.2.1 – For each dollar of government property administered by DCMC during FY 98, there were average losses of \$.00053. This was calculated by dividing the total losses of government property (\$38,700,000) by the total amount of DCMC administered government property on hand as of September 30, 1998 (\$73,067,758,867). The FY 99 strategy is to monitor a selected set of large contractors that exceeded that LDD percentage in FY 98, or those contractors that had a large number of LDD determinations pending. They are:

1. Grumman Aerospace, Bethpage, NY
2. Raytheon Co Missiles Systems, Burlington, MA
3. United Technologies Corp Pratt & Whitney, West Palm Beach, FL
4. Sikorsky Aircraft, Stratford, CT
5. Boeing Vertol, Philadelphia, PA
6. Israel Aircraft Industry Mata
7. Boeing Company Aerospace & Missiles, St. Louis, MO
8. Raytheon Hughes, Tucson, AZ
9. Lockheed Martin Tactical Aircraft, Ft. Worth, TX
10. Lockheed Martin Missile and Space, Sunnyvale, CA
11. Boeing, Huntington Beach, CA

The cognizant CAO for the contractors listed above is responsible for reporting under this performance goal for FY 99. For each contractor identified above, the total amount of government property on hand as of September 30, 1998, should be multiplied by .00053 to determine the FY 99 LDD baseline. The total dollar amount of cumulative closed LDD cases during FY 99 will determine the

contractor performance rating for MMR reporting purposes. The performance rating for the contractor is: Green if LDD is less than 90% of the baseline; yellow if LDD is 90-100% of the baseline; and red if LDD exceeds the baseline. Report both status color and dollar differential when either yellow or red.

Baseline Performance Level – Amount of government property on hand as of September 30, 1998, x .00053 = the FY 99 performance goal for selected contractors.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – PROPERTY.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 104

One Book Chapters - N/A

OPR – DCMC-OA (Government Property)

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy - Primary process drivers are the effectiveness of contractors' government property control systems and the effectiveness of the DCMC property administration process. Among the subtasks are: implement new FAR/DFARS/Property Manual; determine the causes of LDD; track and monitor pacing CAOs' corrective actions; and track and monitor LDD at the selected contractors. In addition to the goals established for selected contractors, all CAOs are expected to achieve their negotiated performance improvement goal and should plan, devise, and budget for their own strategies as needed, consistent with any District guidance.

Why we are doing this:

Higher LDD in FY 98 (\$38.7 million - increase of \$9.6 million over the DCMC goal).

The amount of LDD is our primary measure on how effectively we are managing and controlling government property. If contractors are properly controlling our property, losses should be at a minimum.

What is the Command strategy:

Determine why LDD occurs.

Determine a new baseline for FY 00.

Focus on selected contractors over the baseline and those having a large amount of LDD determinations pending.

What is expected of the CAOs?

Track/monitor the above listed contractors for MMR reporting purposes.

Track/monitor all contractors with LDD (MMR status reporting is only required for the contractors identified above).

Determine if LDD is or should be a factor for system status

(satisfactory/unsatisfactory) If physical inventories are the main factor of LDD, ensure that frequency of inventory is considered.

Investment Goal 2.2.4 – Identify and eliminate policies and procedures that restrict the movement from parts inspection to supplier excellence. Develop alternative methods of assuring quality. (Supports MRM #10)

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: N/A – Will be developed as indicated below.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – N/A

PLAS Process Code(s) – 081

One Book Chapters – 4.4

OPR – DCMC-OB (Supplier Excellence)

OSR – TBD

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Overall schedule:

Establish steering teams (with leaders) for experiments.....	11 Feb 99
Experiment plan development and DCMC-O approval.....	14 May 99
Experiment sites identified.....	15 Jun 99
Local experiment plans/MOAs completed.....	10 Sep 99
Experiment start date.....	01 Oct 99
Experiment end date.....	30 Mar 01
Data analysis and develop recommendations.....	01 May 01
Coordination of recommendations.....	30 Jun 01
Present recommendations to USD.....	30 Jul 01

Strategy: Quality Assurance Experiments: To test promising alternatives to traditional DoD supplier quality assurance by implementing experiments, collecting cost and performance data, analyzing the results, and providing closing recommendations to USD. While some of the proposed experiments will be completed by September 30, 1999, others will continue past that date.

Proposed Experiments:

1. Conduct a small dollar study, via on-site visits to CAOs, to look at how DCMC administers contracts, what value DCMC adds, and what the impact would be if DCMC stopped performing the tasks. Experiment facets:
 - a. Establish steering teams and leader for experiment..... Feb 99
 - b. Experiment plan development and DCMC-O approval Feb 99
 - c. Experiment site selection Feb 99
 - d. Scope of experiments Feb 99
 - e. Experiment leadership and management Feb 99
 - f. Experiment schedule..... Feb 99
 - g. Experiment metrics.....Mar 99
 - h. Experiment data collection.....Mar 99
 - i. Experiment data analysisMay 99
 - j. Experiment conclusions and recommendations..... Jul 99
2. Develop a video to highlight why implementation of MRM #10 is important and to showcase what two CAOs (one in DCMDE, one in DCMDW) are doing to implement MRM #10. The video, which would be a training tool, would emphasize cost per unit output/transaction cost and risk-based analysis to help DCMC personnel recognize the hidden costs of source inspection and when/how to use alternatives. It would help them understand that the mandates of MRM #10 are achievable.
 - a. Establish steering teams and leader for experimentMar 99
 - b. Experiment plan development and DCMC-O approvalMar 99
 - c. Experiment site selection Apr 99
 - d. Scope of experiments Apr 99

- e. Experiment leadership and management Apr 99
 - f. Experiment schedule Apr 99
 - g. Experiment metrics Apr 99
 - h. Experiment data collection Jul 99
 - i. Experiment data analysis Jul 99
 - j. Experiment complete Aug 99
 - k. Experiment released to fieldAug 99
3. Reliance on second and third party quality system approvals through participation with industry associations. A world class quality assurance practice regarding supplier qualification concerns industry collaboration to develop quality system standards and conformance to the standard in lieu of the development of company-unique audits. DoD participation in the development and subsequent acceptance of industry standards reinforces its customer position and further promotes the concept of civil/military integration. DoD acceptance will align its practices with those established by industry. This experiment will pursue DoD representation in other industry associations in the aerospace, automotive, and electronic segments as a member rather than as an observer. Experiment facets:
- a. Establish steering team with leader for experiment11 Feb 99
 - b. Experiment plan development and DCMC-O approval14 May 99
 - c. Experiment site selection15 Jun 99
 - d. Local experiment plans/MOAs completed.....10 Sep 99
 - e. Experiment start date 1 Oct 99
 - f. Experiment end date30 Mar 01
 - g. Data analysis 30 Apr 01
 - h. Development of recommendations 31 May 01
 - i. Coordination of recommendations 29 Jun 01
 - j. Experiment conclusions and recommendations to USD(A&T)..... 30 Jul 01
4. Establish an experimental business process to inspect incoming materiel and perform special screening of stowed materiel at DLA depots. This is a DLA approach to eliminating unnecessary government source inspection through increased emphasis on inspection at destination via sample testing. This would satisfy customer requirements for product inspections (beyond visual condition evaluations) with the establishment of an inspection program of incoming materiel. Experiment facets:
- a. Establish steering team (with leader) for experiment Feb 99
 - b. Experiment site selection Feb 99
 - c. Scope of experiments..... Feb 99
 - d. Experiment leadership and management Feb 99
 - e. Experiment schedule Feb 99
 - f. Experiment metrics Mar 99
 - g. Experiment data collection and reporting Mar 99
 - h. Experiment data analysis..... Jul 99
 - i. Experiment conclusions and recommendations Aug 99
5. Establish an experimental business process that will test the feasibility of contract support to DCMC. This business process will allow us to satisfy customer desired inspection, testing and other DCMC services at remote locations where it is

difficult to recruit and maintain DCMC personnel. It will also allow us to satisfy customer-desired inspection, testing and other DCMC services that require special skill sets that are not cost effective to develop and/or maintain. This is an experiment that will be established to determine the costs, effectiveness and benefits of using industry (non-DoD) personnel to accomplish these activities. With the results of the experiment, cost effectiveness and benefits will be available to determine if contracting out DCMC services is an approach that can be pursued. If the cost/benefit ratio is favorable, this experiment will be expanded to include items that currently require government source inspection. Experiment facets:

- a. Establish steering team with leader for experiments15 Aug 99
 - b. Experiment plan development and DCMC-O approval 13 Oct 99
 - c. Experiment site selection15 Dec 99
 - d. Local experiment plans/MOAs completed.....17 Jan 00
 - e. Experiment start date 17 Jan 00
 - f. Experiment end date17 Jul 01
 - g. Data analysis 31 Aug 01
 - h. Development of recommendations 12 Oct 01
 - i. Coordination of recommendations 14 Dec 01
 - j. Experiment conclusions and recommendations to USD(A&T)..... 31 Jan 02
6. Supplier development. In a study contracted by the MRM #10 IPT, Andersen Consulting identified supplier development as a gap that exists between Government and private industry practices. Typically, industry spends a significant amount of time developing a prospective supplier versus using great post-award quality assurance oversight efforts. As a result, many companies have been able to reduce or eliminate source and receiving inspections. To accommodate this change, it is anticipated that exceptions to existing contracting practices contained in the DFAR will need to be approved. The purpose of this experiment is to determine if a reduction in DCMC quality assurance efforts would occur if DoD adopted this industry practice. DCMC would be the lead on this experiment. This experiment would be begun but not completed by September 30, 2000. Experiment facets: See 5 above.

Why we are doing this:

Source inspection and acceptance are important safeguards for ensuring the quality of DoD materiel. They do, however, represent a cost to the acquisition system that should be incurred only when appropriate. Directed by OUSD(A&T) memorandum dated March 20, 1997, and OSD(Comptroller) memorandum dated May 29, 1997.

What is the Command strategy:

Lead a DoD PAT composed of representatives from the Military Departments and Defense Agencies. The team will conduct a comprehensive review, then develop recommendations to eliminate unnecessary government source inspections for small dollar purchases of both commercial and non-commercial items.

What is expected of the CAOs:

Support the experiments as required; help identify experiment sites; participate in experiments at identified sites. This will involve CAO personnel resources for data collection/analysis and producing periodic reports.

Performance Goal 2.2.5 – Reserved.

Performance Goal 2.2.6 – Reserved.

Performance Goal 2.2.7 – Reserved.

Performance Goal 2.2.8 – Reserved.

Investment Goal 2.2.9 – Reserved.

Performance Goal 2.2.10 – Reserved.

Investment Goal 2.2.99 – Add tasks under this goal to incorporate areas for improvement resulting from the Unit Self-Assessment (USA) that do not relate to any of the goals above but do support Objective 2.2. (Refer to the guidance on supplementing the performance plan on Page C-2.)

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: As applicable

Baseline Performance Level – As applicable

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – As applicable

PLAS Process Code(s) – As applicable

OPR – As applicable

OSR – As applicable

Target Completion Date – As applicable

Strategy – As applicable

Objective 2.3 - Leverage information technology to improve business results.

PLAS Process Codes - None

Performance Goal 2.3.1 – Reserved.

Investment Goal 2.3.2 – Implement the Information Technology (IT) Implementation Plan.

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: N/A - Progress against the status in the IT milestone plan.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A .

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – IT Implementation Plan

PLAS Process Code(s) – 212

One Book Chapters – N/A

OPR – DCMC-AB

OSR – DCMDs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy – Mandated by the IT Management Reform Act. Review the FY98 IT Plan; request comments from the HQ, District, and CAO monthly; update the plan at least monthly; review progress of the IT contents at the SMRs; brief the Commander's Conferences on the status of the IT Plan contents; and compare progress against DLA IT Plan. Districts and CAOs provide comments.

Why we are doing this:

- Provides IT Roadmap for Command

- Establishes linkage across DoD/DLA/DCMC strategic, business, and IT goals and objectives

- Provides focus on business process outcomes

What is the Command strategy for doing it:

- Publish annually in cycle with DLA/DCMC Bus/IT Plans

- Review and update quarterly

- Present at Commander's Conference/Brief contents at SMRs

What is expected of the CAOs:

- Review and comment

Investment Goal 2.3.3 – Reserved.

Investment Goal 2.3.99 – Add tasks under this goal to incorporate areas for improvement resulting from the Unit Self-Assessment (USA) that do not relate to any of the goals above but do support Objective 2.3. (Refer to the guidance on supplementing the performance plan on Page C-2.)

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: As applicable

Baseline Performance Level – As applicable

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – As applicable

PLAS Process Code(s) – As applicable

OPR – As applicable

OSR – As applicable

Target Completion Date – As applicable

Strategy – As applicable

Goal 3 – Enable DCMC people to excel.

Objective 3.1 - Invest to develop and sustain the right talent.

PLAS Process Codes - 054

Performance Goal 3.1.1 – Achieve a training investment level of at least 1.5% of gross payroll costs.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.8.1.4 The actual training investment divided by the actual gross payroll costs year to date.

Baseline Performance Level – Compare total training investment to gross payroll costs.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – District Monthly Obligation Plan (MOP)

PLAS Process Code(s) – 217, 217A-E

One Book Chapters – 12.6

OPR - DCMC-BG

OSR - DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date - September 30, 1999

Strategy -

Why we are doing this:

Dedicate the appropriate level of investment to develop and sustain the right talent

What is the Command strategy:

Compare training investment to gross payroll costs. This goal is centrally managed at HQ DCMC and Districts are not required to report at quarterly MMRs.

What is expected of the CAOs:

Report training expenditures correctly. Need to use our training and development dollars more effectively by using less expensive training methods - e.g., Distance Learning, CBT

Performance Goal 3.1.2 – Develop Individual Development Plans for 100% of DCMC employees.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.8.1.5 - The number of IDPs divided by the total number of full time employees on board at the end of the current month.

Baseline Performance Level – Compare total number of IDPs to total number of employees. Each organization and each supervisor must ensure that all their employees have current IDPs on file. DCMC does not currently have an automated reporting mechanism for this data; therefore, we are not currently requiring reporting on this metric.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Tracked locally.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 217B

One Book Chapters – 12.5

OPR - DCMC-BG

OSR - DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date - September 30, 1999

Strategy -

Why we are doing this:

Achieve DLA strategic objective that all employees will have an IDP

What is the Command strategy:

Develop IDPs which reflect individual and organizational goals

What is expected of the CAOs:

Ensure each employee has a current IDP

Performance Goal 3.1.3 – Achieve a 95% utilization rate for Defense Acquisition University (DAU) quotas received.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.8.1.3 -

The quantity of DAU quotas in the population that were filled by an employee who graduated the course by the total quantity of spaces in the population and multiplying the result by 100.

Baseline Performance Level – Methodology: Based on current projections, we expect to achieve and maintain the 95% utilization rate.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – ATTRS Data base

PLAS Process Code(s) – 217B

One Book Chapters – 12.6

OCR - DCMC-BG

OSR - DCMDs

Target Completion Date - September 30, 1999

Strategy -

Why we are doing this:

In order to ensure compliance with DAWIA requirements we must effectively use quotas obtained for DCMC

What is the Command strategy:

Ensure the appropriate number of DAU quotas are allocated to DCMC

What is expected of the CAOs:

Identify valid requirements and ensure attendance

Performance Goal 3.1.4 – Increase the percentage of personnel that are DAWIA certified to level I (70%), level II (90%), and level III (98%). Maintain or exceed certification levels.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.8.1.2 -

The quantity of Acquisition Workforce employees in the population who are certified at the appropriate level divided by the total quantity of employees in the population required to be certified at that level and multiplying the result by 100.

Baseline Performance Level –Compare position certification requirements to certification level achieved. Based on current projections, we expect the FY98 year end to be level I 45%, level II 88%, level III 76%.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – DLA Training Application

PLAS Process Code(s) – 217B

One Book Chapters – 12.6

OPR - DCMC-BG

OSR - DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date - September 30, 1999

Strategy -

Why we are doing this:

Statutory Certification Program to ensure that an employee meets the professional standards (experience, training and education) established for a career level (I, II , and III).

What is the Command strategy:

Ensure the appropriate number of quotas for DAU courses are allocated to

DCMC

What is expected of the CAOs:

CAOs are expected to schedule their employees on a priority basis for certification.

CAOs should maintain and report goal for each Acquisition Category.

Investment Goal 3.1.5 – Implement the Training Implementation Plan.

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: N/A -

Establishment of Training Plan and track progress against the DCMC and DCMD implementation plan.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Training Implementation Plan

PLAS Process Code(s) – 217B

One Book Chapters – 12.5

OPR - DCMC-BG

OSR - DCMDs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

Strategy -

Why we are doing this:

To clearly define DCMC training initiatives, priorities, and executions

What is the Command strategy:

Establish a detailed training plan which addresses workforce development initiatives, course development, conversion, and execution

What is expected of the CAOs:

Identify needs and priorities and execute accordingly

Performance Goal 3.1.6 –Achieve a benchmark standard of 40 training hours per employee.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.8.1 - The total quantity of training hours charged to PLAS codes 217, 217C, 217D, and 217E during the current fiscal year to date in the population divided by the full time civilian employees on board at the end of the period.

Baseline Performance Level – Total number of employees having 40 or more training hours charged in PLAS and divided by the total number of employees.

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – FY99PLCB.MDC

PLAS Process Code(s) – 217, 217C, 217D, 217E One Book Chapters – 12.6

OPR - DCMC-BG

OSR - DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date - September 30, 1999

Strategy –

Why we are doing this:

Continuing education is required in order to maintain workforce skills

What's the Command strategy:

To develop/make available training opportunities that allow for maximum participation (i.e., CBT) and to invest 1.5% of gross payroll costs in training

What is expected of the CAOs:

To effectively utilize available training opportunities and report PLAS training hours correctly

Investment Goal 3.1.99 – Add tasks under this goal to incorporate areas for improvement resulting from the Unit Self-Assessment (USA) that do not relate to any of the goals above but do support Objective 3.1. (Refer to the guidance on supplementing the performance plan on Page C-2.)

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: As applicable

Baseline Performance Level – As applicable

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – As applicable

PLAS Process Code(s) – As applicable

OPR – As applicable

OSR – As applicable

Target Completion Date – As applicable

Strategy – As applicable

Objective 3.2 – Build and maintain a positive work environment.
--

PLAS Process Codes – None

Performance Goal 3.2.1 - Achieve 100% closure of formal EEO complaint cases within the DLA cycle time of 112 days.
--

Performance Goal Indicator - Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.1.10 –
Count the number of formal EEO complaints through stage 6 for the current month.

Baseline Performance Level - N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data - Data currently resides in locally established databases. The data will reside in the standardized database that DCMC-BF is currently developing.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 213

One Book Chapters - N/A

OPR - DCMC-BA

OSR - DCMDs

Target Completion Date - September 30, 1999

Strategy - DLA is emphasizing EEO complaint resolution and DCMC, in support of DLA emphasis, is providing a means for agency achievement and monitoring. Standardizing the criteria for tracking each of the 6 stages of the cycle time of case closure will assist to identify existing obstacles that impair the District EEO Offices in meeting the DLA Goal of 112 days. Standardization of reporting will also provide an accurate portrayal of the progress towards achievement of the DLA Goal. CAOs will provide data on an as needed basis within internal suspenses to support resolution of formal EEO complaint cases with DLA cycle time.

Why we are doing this:

Tracking EEO complaint cycle times will provide a means for agency achievement and monitoring in support of DLA emphasis

What is the Command strategy:

Standardization of reporting will provide accurate portrayal of the progress towards achievement of the DLA goal of 112 days

What is expected of the CAOs:

CAOs will provide data on an as needed basis

Performance Goal 3.2.2 – Increase the number of EEO (formal and informal) complaint cases referred for Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR) within the EEO process.

Performance Goal Indicator - Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.1.10.1 –

The percentage of formal EEO complaints that have been accepted into the ADR process for the current month divided by the total formal complaints. Baseline Performance Level – Quantity of EEO cases referred for ADR as of the end of FY 98. (CAOs are required to project the end of FY 98 position in order to determine the baseline against which to measure this goal.)

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data - Data collection is in preliminary stage due to recent implementation of ADR Program. The data will reside in the standardized database that DCMC-BF is currently developing.

PLAS Process Code(s) - 213

One Book Chapters – N/A

OPR - DCMC-BA

OSR – DCMDs

Target Completion Date - September 30, 1999

Strategy - Track the total number of EEO Cases in which the complainant opts to use ADR rather than traditional methods to resolve disputes. Also, examine the number of disputes settled as a result of this program. The desired outcome will result in improvement in the timeliness of disputes being settled, cost savings, and less disruption to the workforce. CAOs will provide data on an as needed basis within internal suspenses to support resolution of formal and informal EEO complaint cases referred to ADR.

Why we are doing this:

Increased use of Alternate Dispute Resolution will result in improvement in the timeliness of disputes being settled, cost savings, and less disruption to the workforce

What is the Command strategy:

Track the total number of EEO Cases where the complainant opts to use ADR rather than traditional methods to resolve disputes

What is expected of the CAOs:

CAOs will provide data on an as needed basis

Performance Goal 3.2.3 – Complete 100% of civilian performance appraisals and military evaluation reports on time.

Performance Goal Indicator - Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.1.13 - The number of completed DLA Forms 46 divided by the number of civilian employees due an appraisal.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data - Internal (DCMC) reporting system.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 223

One Book Chapters – N/A

OPR – DCMC-BA

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date - September 30, 1999

Strategy – To ensure all ratings, civilian and military, are completed on time, DCMC has identified this as an area for focus during FY 99. The HQ and Districts are responsible for ensuring that ratings are completed on time. CAOs provide input as required to support this performance goal.

- Civilian Personnel: Completion of civilian personnel evaluations will be done in accordance with DLAD 1434.1 and DLAI 1434.1, Performance Appraisal for the Performance Management System.

- Military Personnel: Completion of military evaluations will be completed in accordance with the appropriate Service regulation (Navy: BUPERSINST 1610.10; Air Force: AFI 36-2402; Army: AR 623-105).

Why we are doing this:

To ensure all performance ratings, civilian and military, are completed on time

What is the Command strategy:

Civilian appraisals will be completed in accordance with DLAD 1434.1 and DLAI 1434.1. Military evaluations will be completed in accordance with the appropriate Service regulation

What is expected of the CAOs:

Provide input in a timely manner to meet suspense dates

Performance Goal 3.2.4 – Improve 7 of the Top 10 Command-wide areas for improvement identified through the FY 1997 Internal Customer measurement.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.5.3 - Will be utilizing Internal Customer Measurement System - Top 10 Command-wide Areas for Improvement identified through the FY 1997 Internal Customer measurement.

Baseline Performance Level – FY 97 baseline extracted from Internal Customer Measurement System

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – Internal Customer Measurement System

PLAS Process Code(s) – Strategy 1, 2, 3: Charge to the process being improved

Strategy 4: 191

One Book Chapters – N/A

Strategy 5: 192

Strategy 6: 191

Strategy 7: 191

OPR – DCMC-BG

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – September 30, 1999

1. **Strategy – In FY 98, improvement action was deployed at all levels of the command in response to the FY 97 Internal Customer measurement. The FY 99 strategy is designed to: (1) continue improvement actions derived from the FY 97 survey data; (2) incorporate the DLA Diversity Program under the umbrella of the DCMC Internal Customer System; and (3) measure the level of improvement achieved, compared against the FY 97 baseline, with a Command-wide re-measurement.** Complete improvement actions and achieve goals established for the 2 AFIs selected from the FY 97 survey data. AFIs not completed in FY 98 roll over to FY 99. Target completion date: NLT September 1999.
2. As FY 97 AFIs are completed, select next AFIs to be addressed from the 1997 “Report of Findings” and the results of DLA’s 1998 Diversity Survey. Target completion date: Continuous.
3. Analyze 1998 Diversity data, select one area to improve, develop a plan for improvement, document the plan and progress using the ICS Quarterly Progress Report format. Due: June 30, 1999.
(a) If the Diversity data augments your existing Internal Customer areas for improvement (see strategies 1 and 2 above), for example, organization culture

and personal development, then the Quarterly Progress Report will document specific actions that are being taken to address the Diversity results under the currently selected areas for improvement.

4. Submit Quarterly Progress Reports for all AFIs being worked on Dec 31, Mar 31, June 30, and Sep 30.
5. Conduct a re-survey of Internal Customers: Survey administered throughout the Command; intent is to reach every employee. Coordinators from Districts and CAOs attend one 2-day Workshop at their District HQ. Target completion date for 2-day workshop: August 13, 1999. Survey Administration: Sep – Nov 99.
6. Document strategies and determine resource requirements: Strategies for improving organization performance (derived from the 1997 Internal Customer Survey results, 1998 Diversity results, and improvement planning) documented in the organization's Performance Plan. Target completion date: July 31, 1999.
7. Augment Unit Self Assessment: Top 10 strengths and top 10 AFIs from the 1997 Internal Customer Survey results, and 1998 Diversity results, support description of appropriate processes in the Unit Self Assessment. Incorporate survey methodology in Category 5.3. Target completion date: July 31, 1999.

Why we are doing this:

Better enable employees to accomplish their day-to-day work through improved processes, procedures, and practices

What is the Command strategy:

FY 97: What should be improved?

FY 98: Improve it!

FY 99: Was it improved? What must be improved next?

What is expected of the CAOs:

Achieve goals associated with the 2 AFIs selected from FY 97 survey data

Select new areas for improvement when FY 97 AFIs are completed

TDY support for ICS Coordinator/owner

Administer questionnaire

Augment USA & Performance Plan

Performance Goal 3.2.5 – Unfair Labor Practices (ULP) and Grievances filed with zero final decisions rendered against DCMC Command-wide.

Performance Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: 1.6.1.2 – The sum of all unfair labor practices and grievances with final decisions rendered against DCMC.

Baseline Performance Level – N/A

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – The data currently resides in locally established logs and registers.

PLAS Process Code(s) – 214

One Book Chapters – 12.3 (in progress)

OPR – DCMC-BA

OSR – DCMDs and CAOs

Target Completion Date – Ongoing

Strategy – Provide training for management officials to increase knowledge of labor laws and labor-management responsibilities to ensure that we are operating in a manner consistent with the DLA Master Agreement between the Defense Logistics Agency and the DLA Council of AFGE Locals, DCMC supplemental agreements and all local agreements. DCMC HQs will also host reoccurring meetings with the Executive Board, DLA Council of AFGE to discuss DCMC initiatives. The DCMC HQs focal point will maintain records on the number of ULPs and grievances with final decisions rendered against DCMC. The Districts labor Relations Officer will compile District and CAO input on these metrics and forward it to the DCMC HQs focal point.

Why we are doing this:

Improve labor management relations within DCMC

What is the Command strategy:

Provide training for management officials to increase knowledge of labor laws and labor-management responsibilities to ensure that we are operating in a manner consistent with the DLA Master Agreement

What is expected of the CAOs:

Ensure managers are trained and track performance goal indicators

Investment Goal 3.2.99 – Add tasks under this goal to incorporate areas for improvement resulting from the Unit Self-Assessment (USA) that do not relate to any of the goals above but do support Objective 3.2. (Refer to the guidance on supplementing the performance plan on Page C-2.)

Investment Goal Indicator – Metrics Guidebook/Computation Reference: As applicable

Baseline Performance Level – As applicable

PowerPlay Cube Name/Other Source of Data – As applicable

PLAS Process Code(s) – As applicable

OPR – As applicable

OSR – As applicable

Target Completion Date – As applicable

Strategy – As applicable